



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,780	02/09/2004	Gregory D. Aviza	00216-674001 / Case 8144	8854
27752	7590	12/10/2008		
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY			EXAMINER	
Global Legal Department - IP			PETERSON, KENNETH E	
Sycamore Building - 4th Floor				
299 East Sixth Street			ART UNIT	
CINCINNATI, OH 45202			PAPER NUMBER	
			3724	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			12/10/2008	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/774,780

Applicant(s)

AVIZA, GREGORY D.

Examiner

Kenneth Peterson

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 28, 38, 39, 43 and 44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 28, 38, 39, 43 and 44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 22,28,38 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobson (4,378,634) in view of Francis (4,868,983).

Jacobson shows a method of making a razor having most of the recited steps including;

Providing a housing (bottom elements of figure 6),

Providing a plurality of blades (36,36'),

Providing 1st and 2nd plastic blocks (4,6), each having non-contiguous slots (16) for receiving the blades such that the blades can move in the slots during shaving (via springs 18).

No part of the subassembly extends past an outer surface of the plastic blocks.

Inserting the integrated subassembly into the housing (figure 6).

Jacobson's housing (bottom elements of figure 6) has just two walls instead of 4, and the guard is on the subassembly instead of on the housing. However, Francis shows that it is old and well known for the housing to have 4 walls and include the guard, as seen in figure 7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Jacobson by making his housing have 4 walls and include the guard, since Francis shows this to be an art recognized equivalent way of achieving the same purpose.

3. Claims 22,28,38,39,43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobson (4,378,634), as modified above, and further in view of Santhagans Van Eibergen et al. (6,671,961).

In regards to at least claims 39 and 44, Jacobson, as modified, lacks a lubricating strip, but this is ubiquitous in the art as seen in Santhagans Van Eibergen (23, lines 18-21, column 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a lubricating strip for Jacobson's housing, as taught by Santhagans Van Eibergen, in order to provide a more pleasant shaving experience.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Peterson whose telephone number is (571)272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on (571)272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kenneth Peterson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724